what would be expected on the basis of chance alone in view of the following facts: (1) Individuals who choose spouses from inside the village, have a fifty-fifty choice, either to marry inside their maximal lineage or outside it. (2) By village marriage rules, this choice is entirely free.

The deviations from this overall pattern in the figures for the marriage patterns of the individual maximal lineages are, in all probability, due to the differences in gross size of the maximal lineages. "A" includes forty-eight per cent of the total population of the village. For "A" men, therefore, about half of the available women are also from "A" in the first place, in addition to the fact that there is a fifty-fifty chance of their choosing from "A." "B" is overwhelmingly exogamous, both in regard to its men and its women. "B" has only six per cent of the total population of the village, divided among six households. Marriage within any one household would be virtually impossible because of incest regulations, and although it happens that members of any one of the households *could*, theoretically, marry into any of the others, there is no instance of it. (The one case of an intra-"B" marriage was between a man of XII and a "deceased" lineage.) Like "A" and "C," "B" people have a theoretical fifty-fifty choice between "B" and "non-B," but because of the small size of "B" its men and women are really forced to take from and marry into the other two maximal lineages. "C" has thirty-five per cent of the total population, and, as might be expected, its marriage patterns reflect its middle position. In contradistinction to "A," "C" men show a moderately strong tendency to take their wives from the other two maximal lineages, but this tendency is not nearly so strong as it is in "B." In regard to its women, however, about the same situation obtains in "C" as in "A," that is, slightly under half of the women are taken by men from other lineages.

To summarize: "A" men tend to take wives from "A" because "A" is so large. "B" and "C" men tend to take their wives from "A" for the same reason. An actual count confirms this generalization. "B" men have taken eight from "A" and one from "C." "C" men have taken fourteen from "A" and three from "B."

One informant was conscious of these tendencies and was of the opinion that in the past, more than fifty years ago at least, they were more pronounced than they are now. This was explained by saying, in effect that "B" and "C" wanted to marry "A" because "A" was more distinguished. "And how did 'A' feel about it?" "Oh, some did not care, but some others minded a great deal." And a story was related of a person in the past with whom the family refused to have anything more to do after the person's marriage to a member of another maximal lineage than "A." No further examples could, however, be adduced. The informant also remarked emphatically that the conduct of the family had been shameful, and that it would never happen in the present day.

For some time, the writer seriously considered the hypothesis that until recently "A" was specifically endogamous, and that "B" and "C" were mutually exogamous, but necessarily endogamous with regard to "A." The probability of

7: Gulick E-5 (1952) 1955 ME1 Lebanon ME1

582 583 The term "incest" is most meaningful when it is restricted to the denotation of the mating and/or marriage of relatives so close that knowledge of the act excites horror and revulsion among the other members of the community to such a degree that the guilty pair may be disgraced, ostracized or even killed. On this definition, the marriage of first cousins in Musqil is not incest. This is indicated by the status of the two pairs of first cousin spouses now living in the village. As far as could be observed, they suffer in no way because of their special relationship, not even from mild ridicule. The fact was singled out for remark as being unusual, against the formal rules, and therefore requiring an episcopal dispensation, but this was all.

582 606 Nevertheless, the marriage of first cousins is restricted, and though not absolutely impossible, difficulties are put in the way of its achievement, and it is rare. In terms of this restriction all first cousins are of equal and undifferentiated status. It is the guess of this writer that (1) the concept of all first cousins being equally close relatives in terms of affective relationships, and (2) the extension of the kinship term *yale* to the male spouses of all first cousins are developments from the pseudo-sibling status of all first cousins which the Church marriage rules established. These three elements of behavior are not in accord with what we would expect to find in a strictly patrilineal system. However, in regard to inheritance and other rights and privileges associated with lineage membership, patrilateral parallel cousins alone have special status, and none of the other types of first cousin count at all. It is important to note that the importance of matrilateral kin is limited to first cousins and their parents, especially the mother's brothers.

Such is the "compromise" between Church regulations and kinship rules as reflected in the various types of behavior associated with first cousins. The theory is admittedly speculative, but in the absence of a better alternative, it is the only interpretation which this writer can give the variously inconsistent phenomena which have been disclosed.

RULES OF INHERITANCE

428 The rules of inheritance are relevant to the subject of kinship and marriage. Preferably, inheritance among the Arabs goes from father to children. According to Koranic and Ottoman law, all sons receive equal shares, and all daughters receive equal shares, but a daughter's share is equal to *half* a son's. As the villagers say: "One son is worth two daughters."

In Musqil, however, daughters customarily do not take their shares, but, instead, make them over to their brothers. Zawar (1953, p. 437) reports exactly 585 the same practice in contemporary Ramallah. Several informants of both sexes said that this was not an unfair arrangement because most brothers give their sisters substantial presents when they are married. Since daughters do not, in actual practice, ordinarily inherit property, their marriage to members of other kin groups does not contribute to any dispersal of family property.

bride and to refer to describe the relationships between them, capital letters will be used to designate individuals. From the village of Dibon (south of Jbeil on the main highway) there are two households: (1) A, his wife, and his mother B; (2) C, his wife D, and three children. From the village of Hlaiele (northward and inland from Beirut) there is one household consisting of E, his wife, an unmarried daughter, a son F, and F's wife G.

B, now a widow, was married twice. By her first husband she bore C. By her second husband she bore A and G. At one time, B's second husband was married to another woman, and from this union there came D who is C's wife. In other words, C's mother was once the wife of his wife's (D's) father. C is the half-brother of A and G who are full siblings. D is a half-sister of A and G, and by stretching things a little one might be able to say that she is a step-sister of her husband (C).

This information came to light as the result of a Core Group informant's comment that C and his wife were brother and sister. After the explanation had been made, the informant said, "Well, they call each other brother and sister sometimes." The relationship clearly evoked humor, but it is possible that looking beneath the humor was a feeling that the connection was a little too close for comfort in the eyes of the Christians.

The presence and various activities in Munsif of the Peripheral Group, the Wheatmen, and the Mawali are, with one exception, concrete evidence of the ethnic division of labor which, in Coon's view (1951), accounts for so many of the salient characteristics of Middle East culture. With this view the present writer is in essential agreement, and a full discussion of its theoretical significance for this study is presented in the chapter "Some Theoretical Considerations."

In this instance, the ethnic distinctions are primarily religious in nature. This conforms with the general pattern of the phenomenon, but there are lacking in Munsif most of the visible cultural differentiations, such as costume, which are often so conspicuous elsewhere. One reason for this homogeneity of appearance in Munsif is the fact that nearly everyone concerned is from the same urban small region, Northern Lebanon, although several different communities are represented.

It has been noted that there are really two classes of people in the Peripheral Group. One of these, the Greek Orthodox nuclear family from Ijeita, represents the kind of internal migration which is of common occurrence in the region. Long ago, a similar group by a similar action established the community itself. With respect to the Core Group, the Orthodox family in the Peripheral Group really does not exemplify Coon's ethnic division of labor. The remainder of the Peripheral Group do, however. They differ among themselves, and with respect to the Core Group, in the important matter of religion. Also, they are outsiders to the local group. In terms of the structural theory which is presented in the chapter "Some Theoretical Considerations," each is a representative of a more widely distributed segment of Sphere 4 (Sect Group) within another, locally established, Sphere 4 segment which is itself an enclave in the area of another segment of Sphere 4. Functionally, all these members of the Peripheral Group serve the Core Group as hired hands in capacities which are generally regarded as menial. It was quite evident that members of the Core Group would be very unwilling to serve each other in such capacities.

What is true of members of the Peripheral Group as individuals is essentially true